



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,629	05/13/2001	Mary Lou Floyd	308,650	5777
7590	06/09/2006		EXAMINER	
ABELMAN FRAYNE & SCHWAB 666 Third Avenue 10th Floor New York, NY 10017-5621			FADOK, MARK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/681,629	FLOYD, MARY LOU
	<b>Examiner</b> Mark Fadok	<b>Art Unit</b> 3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2006.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 3-18 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 3-18 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

***Response to Amendment***

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to office action mailed 12/21/2005, which was received 3/22/2006. Acknowledgment is made that no amendments were presented. The examiner has carefully considered applicant's arguments, but does not find them persuasive. Therefore the previous office action is restated below.

**Examiner's Note**

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers or figures in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 3-5,7-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perkowsky (2005/0251458).**

**In regards to claim 3,** Perkowsky discloses a method for searching a computer network for a product associated with a brand name (FIG 4A1), the method comprising the steps of

inputting a query message into an online device accessing a portal to a predetermined website, wherein the query message approximates the brand name associated with the product (FIG 4A1, Zantac approximates Zantac 75);

searching only a plurality of brand names for a first match of the query message with a matching brand name (page 4, para 0041); and

outputting a first uniform resource locator (URL) address associated with the matching brand name and providing information about the product (page 4, para 0041).

**In regards to claim 4,** Perkowsky teaches wherein the brand name is selected from the group consisting of a company name of a desired company and a product line name of a specific product line (page 4, para 0041).

**In regards to claim 5**, Perkowski teaches wherein the online device is computer (FIG 2).

**In regards to claim 7**, Perkowski teaches accessing an Internet-based website using the first URL address associated with the matching brand name (page 4, para 0041).

**In regards to claim 8**, Perkowski teaches wherein the Internet-based website is distinct from the predetermined website associated with the portal (FIG 2 and 2A).

**In regards to claim 9**, Perkowski teaches wherein the step of accessing an Internet-based website using the first URL address includes the step of accessing an information webpage associated with the matching brand name (FIG 4A1).

**In regards to claim 10**, Perkowski teaches wherein the information webpage displays information associated with the matching brand name, with the information being selected from the group consisting of special promotions, store locations, store hours, phone numbers, and current sales (FIG 4A2).

**In regards to claims 11-13 and 15-17**, these are considered to be parallel claims to those above and are rejected for the same rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 6,14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkowski in view of Official Notice.**

In regards to claims 6,14 and 18, Perkowski teaches the use of an interactive screen (FIG 3A2), but does not specifically mention that the online device is a television. The examiner takes official notice that the use of interactive televisions to provide services such as those taught by Perkowski were old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include in Perkowski the use of an interactive television, because this would include another means for providing access to the information, thus increasing revenue from people who use interactive televisions for online shopping and information gathering.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 3/22/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

***Official Notice Traverse***

A “traverse” is a denial of an opposing party’s allegations of fact. The Examiner respectfully submits that applicants’ arguments and comments do not appear to traverse what Examiner regards as knowledge that would have been generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Even if one were to interpret applicants’ arguments and comments as constituting a traverse, applicants’ arguments and comments do not appear to constitute an adequate traverse because applicant has not specifically pointed out the supposed errors in the examiner’s action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. 27 CFR 1.104(d)(2), MPEP 707.07(a). An adequate traverse must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying Examiner’s notice of what is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Boon, 439 F.2d 724, 728, 169 USPQ 231, 234 (CCPA1971).

If applicant does not seasonably traverse the well known statement during examination, then the object of the well known statement is taken to be admitted prior art. In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

In response to applicant’s argument that Perkowski includes additional structure not required by applicant’s invention, it must be noted that Perkowski discloses the invention as claimed. The fact that it discloses additional structure not claimed is

irrelevant. The applicant should further consider that the use of the term "only" does not exclude this feature from Perkowski since it is inclusive in the reference. Further applicant admits on page 8 that the instant invention is not limited to brand names with the statement that "trademarks" are included.

In response to applicant's argument that Perkowski is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Perkowski is clearly concerned with Brand name exposure.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., For instance collecting revenue, advertisement, differences between the models, automatic inclusion of companies to the database ect.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Applicant argues long felt need on page 12, this type of information should be submitted in an affidavit to provide a vehicle for consideration by the examiner of applicant's claim of long felt need.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-6755**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Thursday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wynn Coggins** can be reached on **(571) 272-7159**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **receptionist** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3600**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner for Patents***

***P.O. Box 1450***

***Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450***

or faxed to:

**(571) 273-8300** [Official communications; including

After Final communications labeled

"Box AF"]

**(571) 273-6755** [Informal/Draft communications, labeled

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]



Mark Fadok

Primary Examiner